



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,650	03/17/2004	Kazuhiro Takeda	SIC-04-003	2649
29863	7590	12/01/2005	EXAMINER	
DELAND LAW OFFICE P.O. BOX 69 KLAMATH RIVER, CA 96050-0069				NGUYEN, THU V
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		3661		

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/708,650	TAKEDA ET AL.
	Examiner Thu Nguyen	Art Unit 3661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/22/04</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

The response to the restriction requirement filed on September 15, 2005 has been entered. By this response, group I (claims 1-16) have been elected, and group II (claims 17-21) are withdrawn from consideration, all claims 1-21 are now pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
2. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brisson (US 5,335,188) in view of Stockdale et al (US 6,804,763).

As per claim 1-2, Brisson teaches a bicycle information processing apparatus, the apparatus comprises: a memory 66 (fig.6) for storing information related to the bicycle (col.3, lines 62-65); an information processing unit 61 (fig.6) that accesses the memory and processes information (col.7, line 65). Brisson does not teach a power supply sensor that detects supply power so that the memory can be accessed. However, Stockdale suggests detecting supply power voltage to determine if the memory should be accessed (col.23, lines 23-37; col.26, lines 28-39), furthermore, using power supply sensor for detecting supply power would have been well known. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to implement the memory and a well known power supply sensor to the bicycle information processing apparatus of Brisson to prevent data accessing when the power level is low as taught by Stockdale in order to prevent data loss due to power failure as taught by Stockdale in col.2, lines 31-33.

As per claim 3, Brisson teaches an information display (fig.2).

As per claim 4, Stockdale teaches detecting voltage (col.23, lines 60-63).

As per claim 5-6, Stockdale teaches power storage unit (battery) 505 (fig.5) and power source (col.23, line 30-33), further, using a rechargeable power storage battery for storing power from the power supply would have been well known. Further with respect to claim 6, refer to claim1 above, moreover, detecting the power to determine if the battery is capable of supplying power when the power is switched to the storage unit 505 (fig.5) to prevent data lost when the power is supplied from the battery would have been both known and obvious in view of Stockdale's teaching.

As per claim 7, including certain selected electronic components in a housing to protect the components and to facilitate mounting the components on certain device would have been both well known and obvious matter of design choice.

As per claim 8, refer to claim 3 above.

As per claim 9-10, mounting the display in the same housing with the processor, the memory and power monitor unit or mounting the display in a separate housing to facilitate mounting the display in an appropriate position on the vehicle would have been both well known and obvious matter of design choice.

As per claim 11-12, Brisson teaches that the information processing unit provides data to the display (col.9, lines 23-32), including a receiver for receiving data transmitted from the information processing unit would have been well known, since Brisson teaches that the display accept data from the information processing unit, Brisson obviously encompasses teaching the receiver for receiving data from the information processing unit.

As per claim 13, Brisson teaches cumulative information including travel distance (col.9, lines 23-25; col.5, lines 12-14, lines 30-34), moreover, keeping record of total distance traveled of a vehicle depending on the information the designer want to provide to the user would have been both well known and obvious matter of design choice.

As per claim 14-16, Brisson teaches initiating computation of second cumulative information (col.10, lines 3-5); storing cumulative information in response to operation of the

start input component (col.4, lines 32-35, lines 50-51). Further, refer to claim 13 above concerning the first and second cumulative information.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-6967. The examiner can normally be reached on T-F (7:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

November 23, 2005



**THU V. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER**